



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,803	02/22/2006	Takeshi Sakamoto	125447	6745
25944	7590	04/09/2009	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			ZARROLI, MICHAEL C	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2839			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
04/09/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/551,803	Applicant(s) SAKAMOTO ET AL.
	Examiner Michael C. Zarroli	Art Unit 2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-11 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-8 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 9-10 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 February 2009 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 9-10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umehara in view of Leupold (US4810986).

Umehara discloses a permanent magnet member 3/13 for a voice coil motor (intended use recitation, not positively recited), the permanent magnet member being a planar fig. 1b permanent magnet member and comprising a magnet body and a corrosion-resistance formed on a surface of the magnet body (col. 11 line 67 to col. 12 line 1), the permanent magnet member having a top surface and a bottom surface opposing each other fig. 18.

Umehara discloses plating not a film of corrosion resistant material. Umehara also does not disclose the recess with the particular dimensions.

Leupold discloses recesses in the top and bottom sides of a permanent magnet fig. 2. At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Umehara with a recess in one or both of the major sides of the permanent magnet as taught by Leupold. The motivation for this is well known in this art and would be to adjust the magnetic geometries of the permanent magnet.

Umehara in view of Leupold does not disclose the particular dimensions of the recess. At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to set the dimensions of the recess as recited in claim 9.

Regarding the particular dimensions of the recess, to the extent that Umehara in view of Leupold does not specify exact dimensions, at the time of the invention, workable dimensions of the applicant's would have been a matter of routine experimentation. *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618 (CCPA 1977). Variations in the distance would have been obvious minor adjustments without patentable significance. *See In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955) (Where general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover optimal or workable ranges by routine experimentation).

Umehara in view of Leupold also does not disclose film material corrosion resistance. At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to change the corrosion resistance plating of Umehara to a film. The claim would have been obvious because the substitution of one known element for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Claim 10 Umehara discloses that the permanent magnet member comprises a shorter periphery, a longer periphery located at a position separated from the shorter periphery by a predetermined distance, and a pair of side peripheries connecting the shorter and longer peripheries to each other, and has a fan-shaped planar form fig. 2.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Zarroli whose telephone number is 571-272-2101. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, T.C. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2800 ext 39. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael C. Zarroli/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit
2839

/M. C. Z./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2839
MCZ